

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In response to the Office Action mailed September 6, 2006, the Examiner's claim rejections have been considered. Claims 1, 20, 33, and 41 have been amended. Support for the amendments to the claims is found at page 15, line 21- page 16, line 4. No new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections regarding all pending claims and earnestly solicit allowance of these claims.

#### **1. Claim Rejections – Double Patenting**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 20, 33 and 41 on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claims 1-6 of Luciano et al. (US 6,685,559).

In response, Applicants respectfully submit a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §1.321(c) to overcome the double patenting rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 20, 33 and 41.

#### **2. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection: Claims 1, 3-14, 17-20, 25-31, 33-35, 37, 39-41 and 44-46**

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-14, 17-20, 25-31, 33-35, 37, 39-41 and 44-46 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilms (US 5,277,424) and Congello, Jr. (US 6,296,569), and further in view of Rowe et al. (US 6,6822,421). For the sake of brevity, the rejections of independent claims 1, 20, 33, and 41 are discussed in detail on the understanding that the dependent claims are also patentably distinct over the prior art, as they depend directly from their respective independent claims. Nevertheless, the dependent claims include additional features that, in combination with those of the independent claims, provide further, separate and independent bases for patentability.

Applicants respectfully submit that Wilms, Congello, and Rowe, either alone or in combination, fail to teach, suggest, or disclose a gaming device that "stores information relating to full credits, partial credits, redemption values, and selected credit values to a database." The ability to store this information allows for more complete accounting and a determination of the success and popularity of different denominations for a given gaming machine. Applicants respectfully submit that Wilms, Congello, and Rowe are completely silent with respect to any statistical analysis and do not teach, suggest, or disclose the claimed database. Accordingly,

Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is patentably distinct over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants request allowance of these claims.

**3. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections: Claims 15-16, 23-24, 36, and 43**

The Examiner rejected claims 15-16, 23-24, 36, and 43 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilms and Congello, Jr. and Rowe et al. as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Skratulia (US 5,690,335).

Applicants note that claims 15-16, 23-24, 36, and 43 are dependent claims that depend from independent claims 1, 20, 33, and 41, respectively. In light of the arguments submitted in Section 2 of this response, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 15-16, 23-24, 36, and 43 are not obvious in view of the combination of Wilms, Congello, Jr. and Skratulia because these references, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the claimed limitations. Moreover, these dependent claims further recite and define the claimed invention, and thus, are independently patentable. In conclusion, Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 15-16, 23-24, 36, and 43 have been overcome.

**CONCLUSION**


Applicants have made an earnest and *bona fide* effort to clarify the issues before the Examiner and to place this case in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of all of claims 1, 3-20, 23-31, 33-37, 39-41, and 43-46 is believed to be in order, and a timely Notice of Allowance to this effect is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fees indicated in the Fee Transmittal, any additional fee(s) or underpayment of fee(s) under 37 CFR 1.16 and 1.17, or to credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. 194293, Deposit Account Name STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP.

Should the Examiner have any questions concerning the foregoing, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (310) 734-3200. The undersigned attorney can normally be reached Monday through Friday from about 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM Pacific Time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 6, 2006



---

Andrew B. Chen  
Reg. No. 48,508  
STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP  
2121 Avenue of the Stars  
Suite 900  
Los Angeles, CA 90067  
Tel 310.734.3200  
FAX 310.734.3300